

App. No.: 10/605843
Filed: October 30, 2003
Conf. No.: 2842

Page 4 of 5

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the invention and to further distinguish over the applied art, either alone or in combination.

First it is most respectfully submitted that the Examiner has inadvertently mischaracterized the teaching of the basic applied reference, Mingo et al. Although this reference makes comments about the problem of reverse running it in fact operates to prevent stalling of the engine that occurs before any tendency to run in reverse may occur and thus requires a determination of the condition of the starter motor and whether it is engaged with the engine or not. This is not done with applicants method or apparatus. In addition, contrary to the Examiner's allegation that firing of the spark plug is permitted on the occurrence of another starting operation, the firing is disabled until a predetermined time has elapsed and hence any starting operation initiated before that time will not be possible. Also the Examiner's attention is directed to the fact that the method described in FIG. 8 is described in the reference to be a "back up" to the method whereby stalling is determined by a decrease in engine speed below a preset value. The paragraph referred to by the Examiner clearly states that firing is enabled only "after a preset time".

Thus the reference does not compare speed with a previously measured speed as now clearly claimed but an absolute measured speed. Thus the reference will prevent any attempt to restart the engine once the speed has fallen below that preset speed until a preset time period has passed. Thus the reference stops the engine before any reverse running can occur and prohibits restarting until a time period elapses. Quite different from the operation claimed by applicants.

Also the Examiner's proposed combination relying on the teaching of Ozawa is also most respectfully challenged. Note that Mingo et al does show a crank position sensor identified by the reference numeral 160, but measures engine speed from generator output as do applicants. Thus why would one skilled in the art make such a substitution?

The dependent claims submitted also recite a number of distinctions not present in either reference and if the Examiner persists in his rejection he is most respectfully requested to point out claim by claim how he is reading the claims on the references alone or combined.

App. No.: 10/605843
Filed: October 30, 2003
Conf. No.: 2842

Page 5 of 5

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration is most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted:



Ernest A. Beutler
Reg. No. 19901

Phone (949) 721-1182
Pacific Time